

## FACULTY OF LAW

<b>Recommendation 1</b>	The Review Team recommends that the Faculty liaise with the Faculty of Architecture regarding that Faculty's processes around the review and reporting of trends from SCEQ, SREQ and CEQ results. Section 3.6.2)
<b>Action taken by the Faculty</b>	The Head of School spoke with Kristine Sodersten of the Faculty of Architecture on the strategies they adopted, including plotting the results of individual elements of the SCEQ on a graph each year so that progress can be tracked over time, and distributing these to Faculty.
<b>Further action planned but not yet implemented (if appropriate)</b>	The Head of School asked Teaching and Curriculum Committee to examine the results of the SCEQ including the patterns over time and the results of benchmarking against other GO7 law schools. T & C will include this in their reports. The idea of plotting the results on a graph which is continually updated will also be taken up.
<b>Faculty's evaluation of the success of action taken</b>	Recommendation implemented and better procedures developed as a consequence.
<b>Recommendation 2</b>	The Review Team recommends that the Associate Dean (Postgraduate Coursework) develop an accessible communication channel for communication with postgraduate students. (Section 3.6.4)
<b>Action taken by the Faculty</b>	The matter was referred to the Postgraduate Coursework Committee. The Committee noted the considerable differences between the undergraduate and postgraduate programs. Because the postgraduate programs are so diverse, and likewise the issues on which communication may be needed or desirable are so varied, it is considered that the channels of communication should first of all be to the Program Coordinators for the specialist programs and the two academic staff responsible for the LLM and Graduate Diploma in Law. The Committee resolved to ensure that incoming and continuing students are clearly informed of the appropriate communication channels for dealing with problems arising in relation to the postgraduate program.
<b>Further action planned but not yet implemented (if appropriate)</b>	To ensure that the appropriate channels of communication are made clearer in the "Welcome Kit" and in the Postgraduate Handbook.
<b>Faculty's evaluation of the success of action taken</b>	Recommendation implemented.
<b>Recommendation 3</b>	The Review Team recommends that the Faculty liaise with Sue Silveira and Helen Wozniak from the School of Applied Vision Sciences regarding their work on student online interactivity using WebCT. (Section 3.7.5)
<b>Action taken by the Faculty</b>	Lucy Taylor, the WebCT administrator in the law school, attended a CHASS workshop at which Sue Silveira and Helen Wozniak presented on 19 May 2005. A teaching development workshop was held for the Faculty on 26 May 2005 and this included a discussion of Quiz Tool and other interactive features of WebCT.
<b>Further action planned but not yet implemented (if appropriate)</b>	Continuing discussion of WebCT in teaching development workshops.
<b>Faculty's evaluation of the success of action taken</b>	Recommendation implemented. Use of interactive features of WebCT continuing to be monitored by WebCT administrator.

<b>Recommendation 4</b>	The Review Team recommends that the Faculty proceed with the review of Units of Study and standardisation at 6 credit points as a priority activity; as this Faculty teaches double degrees it is important to provide students with coherence. The Review Team draws the Faculty's attention to the 2006 deadline. (Section 4.1.3)
<b>Action taken by the Faculty</b>	Curriculum Review has been given very high priority in 2005 with a view to finalisation of the revised first year program by December 2005. Consultation has occurred with all partner Faculties on transition arrangements for 2006, and all students have been notified. It is proposed that the revised first year curriculum will be introduced for 2007.
<b>Further action planned but not yet implemented (if appropriate)</b>	The Faculty has been considering whether and how to move to a 6 credit point curriculum for all three years of the Law degree. Given the complexity of so doing, the Faculty has decided to take a staged approach, dealing with the first year of Law (first three years of Combined Law) by the end of 2005 and then continuing discussion of more comprehensive curriculum revision after that. While the Faculty does not need to amend years 2 and 3 in order to comply with Academic Board policy since no other Faculties are affected, it is actively considering the benefits of such a change. Detailed proposals have already been developed which will be discussed further in 2006.
<b>Faculty's evaluation of the success of action taken</b>	Recommendation implemented and progress being made to put a new curriculum in place for commencement in 2007 (Law I and Combined Law 1-III). Transition plan agreed with partner Faculties and notified to students.
<b>Recommendation 5</b>	The Review Team recommends that the Faculty move into compliance with Academic Board Policy on Awards with Honours. (Section 4.2.4)
<b>Action taken by the Faculty</b>	The issue of Honours has been considered a number of times by the Faculty in the last five years. It will be considered further in the context of the curriculum review.
<b>Further action planned but not yet implemented (if appropriate)</b>	See above.
<b>Faculty's evaluation of the success of action taken</b>	In progress. Resolution of the issue of compliance with Academic Board policy on honours involves complex issues about workload and student choice in the optional program, and so therefore needs to be considered in the context of a wider curriculum review.
<b>Recommendation 6</b>	The Review Team recommends that the Faculty ensure that the links between Generic Graduate Attributes and Contextualised Graduate Attributes and the content and assessment of Units of Study are made clear to students. (Section 4.4.4)
<b>Action taken by the Faculty</b>	Considered by the Teaching and Curriculum Review Committee. The Generic Graduate attributes adopted in 1993 by the Academic Board were contextualised for law and adopted by Faculty at its meeting of 3 August 2004. They now appear in the Faculty Handbook every year. The Director of Teaching reminded all staff of the attributes, where to find them, and encouraged staff to link these to their teaching and include them in their unit outlines.
<b>Further action planned but not yet implemented (if appropriate)</b>	
<b>Faculty's evaluation of the success of action taken</b>	Steps taken to implement recommendation, but needs ongoing monitoring of teaching practices.
<b>Recommendation 7</b>	The Review Team recommends that the Faculty undertake an audit of assessment practices. The Faculty should aim for consistency and compliance with Academic Board policies. (Section 4.6.4)
<b>Action taken by the Faculty</b>	Teaching and Curriculum Committee has assembled and updated all existing Faculty regulations and policies re assessment and reviewed and changed some of these. Existing regulations will be finally updated and publicised to all staff in November 2005 to ensure that all staff understand and comply with the regulations.
<b>Further action planned but not yet implemented (if appropriate)</b>	During 2006 those regulations and policies will be further reviewed, amended and developed. Consistency with Academic Board Policy will be considered further in 2006.
<b>Faculty's evaluation of the success of action taken</b>	In progress.

<b>Recommendation 8</b>	The Review Team recommends that the Faculty make greater use of its Graduate Diploma programs as a required pathway to postgraduate study for non-lawyers. This may assist the Faculty to address the different audiences in its postgraduate program and facilitate the Faculty in meeting the different expectations and experiences of students. (Section 4.8.5)
<b>Action taken by the Faculty</b>	This matter has been considered by the Postgraduate Coursework Committee of the Faculty. The Faculty does sometimes offer candidates admission to the Graduate Diploma only, even where applicants seek admission to the Masters' degree. It does so where there is doubt about the capacity of an applicant to complete a degree. The Faculty will certainly consider the greater use of this strategy when it is concerned about the capacity of non-lawyers to complete the degree.
<b>Further action planned but not yet implemented (if appropriate)</b>	For noting in admissions process.
<b>Faculty's evaluation of the success of action taken</b>	Implemented.
<b>Recommendation 9</b>	The Review Team recommends that the PG Research Room be available to RHD students during the same hours as the Library. (Section 6.1.8)
<b>Action taken by the Faculty</b>	The hours of the PG Research Room have been extended so that it now closes within half an hour of the close of the library and the building. Because the attendants need to check the building, this is the latest that the room can remain open.
<b>Further action planned but not yet implemented (if appropriate)</b>	None needed.
<b>Faculty's evaluation of the success of action taken</b>	Implemented.
<b>Recommendation 10</b>	The Review Team recommends that RHD students be automatically included in the research cluster of their supervisor and they be given opportunities to join other clusters of interest to their research. (Section 6.2.5)
<b>Action taken by the Faculty</b>	All RHD students are now listed on the website under the different research clusters. Some research students are engaged in work that is relevant to more than one research cluster. Research students are invited to cluster meetings, conferences and activities. Research clusters vary considerably in the extent to which they meet and can provide opportunities for such engagement. Some are organised around Centres and Institutes. Others are much looser affiliations.
<b>Further action planned but not yet implemented (if appropriate)</b>	None required.
<b>Faculty's evaluation of the success of action taken</b>	Success depends on the level of activity of the research cluster.
<b>Recommendation 11</b>	The Review Team recommends that RHD students be invited to the weekly lunchtime seminars to increase their sense of inclusion in a community of scholars. (Section 6.3.5)
<b>Action taken by the Faculty</b>	All RHD students notified by email of lunchtime seminars and invited to attend.
<b>Further action planned but not yet implemented (if appropriate)</b>	None needed.
<b>Faculty's evaluation of the success of action taken</b>	International RHD students, in particular, regularly attend the weekly lunchtime seminars.